



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,581	10/12/2005	Kazunori Yamate	2005_1580A	2533
52349	7590	09/10/2009		
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK LLP. 1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			EXAMINER	
			TRAN, MY CHAUT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/552,581	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAMATE, KAZUNORI
	<b>Examiner</b> MY-CHAU T. TRAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-10 and 12-20 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 1,2,4-10 and 12-16 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 17-20 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 October 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

*Application and Claims Status*

1. Applicant's amendment and response filed 06/19/2009 are acknowledged and entered.
  
2. Claims 1-16 were pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, and 12; cancelled claims 3 and 11; and added claims 17-20. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-20 are currently pending and are under consideration in this Office Action.

*Priority*

3. This instant application is a 371 of PCT/JP04/005415 filed on 04/15/2004, and as a result this instant application has the effective filing date of 04/15/2004.

*Specification*

4. The substitute specification and abstract filed 06/19/2009 are acknowledged and entered.
  
5. The amendment filed 06/19/2009 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:
  - a. On page 1 of the substitute specification, the term “*the thin sheet-type case*” was added to the disclosure in line 18. This addition extends the scope of the disclosure

and as a result is considered new matter. Moreover, neither the original disclosure nor the original claims support this term. See MPEP § 706.03(o).

b. On page 10 of the substitute specification, the phrase *“are disposed in its width directions”* was deleted. The omission of this phrase extends the scope in regard to the structural relationship between the sheet-type insulator and signal lines of the disclosure. Therefore, this omission is considered new matter. See MPEP § 706.03(o).

c. On page 14 of the substitute specification, the formula of

$$C = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{C_a} + \frac{1}{C_f}} \approx \frac{C_f \cdot C_a}{C_f + C_a} = \frac{C_a}{1 + \frac{C_a}{C_f}}$$

“” was deleted. The omission of this formula extends the scope in regard to the capacitance of the disclosure. Thus, this omission is considered new matter. See MPEP § 706.03(o).

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. (This is a new matter rejection.)

**A.** Claims 17 and 19 recite the limitation of ‘*a plate-shaped member which fixes at least a part of the cable connected between the substrates such that at least the part of the cable connected between the substrates extends along the conductive chassis*’, i.e. the combination of both the cable and all the substrates “*extends along the conductive chassis*”. This limitation, which narrows the structural relationship among the instant claimed cable, substrates, and the conductive chassis, is not supported by the originally filed specification and/or claims; nor has applicant provided any indication where such support exists. See MPEP § 714.02, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, last sentence; MPEP § 2163.02; and MPEP § 2163.06. For example, the originally filed specification discloses that in the first embodiment the pressing plates are connected to the flexible cables at two places in their length directions and in the second embodiment the connection is made at one place in the length directions of the flexible cable (see original specification pg. 16, lines 16-21; figs. 1A and 6B). Additionally, as depicted by figure 1A, only the upper and lower data driver substrates extend ‘*along the conductive chassis*’. Therefore, the originally filed specification does not provide support for this limitation. Furthermore, the original claims do not recite this limitation, i.e. ‘*a plate-shaped member which fixes at least a part of the cable connected between the substrates such that at least the part of the cable connected between the substrates extends along the conductive chassis*’. Consequently, this limitation has no specification or original claim support, and it is considered new matter.

If applicants disagree, applicant should present a detailed analysis as to why the claimed subject matter has clear support in the specification.

**B.** Claims 18 and 20 recite the limitation of ‘*a plate-shaped member which fixes at least a part of the cable connected between the display panel and the substrate such that at least the*

part of the cable connected between the display panel and the substrate extends along the conductive chassis', i.e. the combination of the cable, display panel, and the substrate "extends along the conductive chassis". This limitation, which narrows the structural relationship among the instant claimed cable, display panel, substrate, and the conductive chassis, is not supported by the originally filed specification and/or claims; nor has applicant provided any indication where such support exists. See MPEP § 714.02, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, last sentence; MPEP § 2163.02; and MPEP § 2163.06. For example, the originally filed specification discloses that in the first embodiment the pressing plates are connected to the flexible cables at two places in their length directions and in the second embodiment the connection is made at one place in the length directions of the flexible cable (see original specification pg. 16, lines 16-21; figs. 1A and 6B). Additionally, as depicted by figure 1A, only the upper and lower data driver substrates extend 'along the conductive chassis'. Therefore, the originally filed specification does not provide support for this limitation. Furthermore, the original claims do not recite this limitation, i.e. '*a plate-shaped member which fixes at least a part of the cable connected between the display panel and the substrate such that at least the part of the cable connected between the display panel and the substrate extends along the conductive chassis*'. Consequently, this limitation has no specification or original claim support, and it is considered new matter.

If applicants disagree, applicant should present a detailed analysis as to why the claimed subject matter has clear support in the specification.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-16 are allowable.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MY-CHAU T. TRAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0810. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday: 8:00-2:30; Tuesday-Thursday: 7:30-5:00; Friday: 8:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A. Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MY-CHAU T. TRAN/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2629

September 9, 2009